

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| FANG-YUH HSIEH, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | No. C06-5281 PJH (BZ) |
| |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER TAKING PLAINTIFF'S |
| |) | MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA FOR |
| R. JAMES NICHOLSON, |) | EMPLOYMENT RECORDS OFF |
| |) | CALENDAR |
| Defendants. |) | |
| _____ |) | |


IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to quash the subpoena issued for production and inspection of his employment records is taken off calendar for failing to comply with my previous orders.¹ My December 5, 2006 Initial Discovery Order requires parties to first "meet in person" and then "participate in a telephone conference with the Court before filing any discovery motions or other papers." Plaintiff does not appear to have done either yet.

In deciding whether to raise this dispute again,

¹ I have repeatedly admonished plaintiff to comply with my orders. Plaintiff is warned that failure to do so may result in the imposition of sanctions.

1 plaintiff should be mindful that "a motion to quash must be
2 made before the production or deposition date identified in
3 the subpoena." Anderson v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc.,
4 2007 WL 1994059, *8 (S.D.Cal. 2007).

5 Dated: November 20, 2007

6 
7 Bernard Zimmerman
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9

10 G:\BZALL\REFS\HSIEH\Order Denying Motion to Quash.wpd
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28